

Mr. Haynes Johnson
Washington Post
1150 15 St., NW
Washington, D.C. 20071

7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, Md. 21701
11/25/88

Dear Mr. Johnson,

In your today's column you ask "what else can be added to the torrent of broadcast, film and print retrospective analyses that have been produced in the quarter century since Dallas...what difference does it make...what can be added?" You conclude, among other things, that TV "retold the Kennedy assassination story."

Praising TV for its recollection of the Kennedy presidency is one thing but saying that nothing can be added by it to the assassination story is three-monkeys journalism and a confession of such ignorance as should make you ashamed.

What difference does it make, your words, if there is only "reasonable doubt" about the official story you endorse? "Reasonable Doubt" is the title of a documentary that was shown in Washington, its showing duly reported by the Post.

If you saw ~~it~~ ^{and} it, could still write what you did that is shameful. So also is it shameful not to be aware of the substantial and unrefuted criticism of the official story in books and in FOIA litigation almost all of which the Post saw fit not to report. While, I add, endorsing the official story.

I am a former investigative reporter, Senate investigator and editor and war-time intelligence analyst. I wrote the first book critically analyzing the Warren Report and I've brought to light pretty much all that is factual about the official investigations in, among other things, six books and a considerable volume of FOIA litigation. I'm not a conspiracy theorist, as I'm sure George Lardner will tell you, I've defended the FBI and CIA against unjust criticism (George once accused me of defending the FBI), and I was the credited and not credited source of most of the stories critical of the irresponsible House assassins committee.

Your column, whether or not intended, endorses some of the rottenest TV I'm aware of, all save this one documentary on the assassination and its investigation. Some of those you praise for other TV utter deliberate lies about the assassination. *Jim what you know*

I'm pretty sure George will confirm all I say above and can add that in all these many years he is not aware of any factual error I've made. My work has been tested in court, where I've made myself subject to the penalties of perjury had I erred. Not many writers establish their accuracy this way. If George does not confirm this I'm sure the lawyer who handled most of this litigation will. He is Jim Lesar, 393/1921.

I'm pretty sure A & E provided a videotape to the Post and that if it did not it or the Maryland graduate student whose thesis it is will. If you could spend all that time immersed in shtomaltz and garbage, please take about 50 minutes ~~at the~~ ^{least} for your own information and for your professional and personal integrity if you write about this again.

You are, of course, welcome to access to anything I have, now stored in about 60 file cabinets and numerous boxes and to be an open, public archive at local Hood College. Most of those who use my records espouse what I do not agree with, including some of the recent shows, but I believe that FOIA made me surrogate for the people and make it all available while seeking not to censor what others can write and believe. In less than 10 minutes I can show you records I got under FOIA that will certainly fill you with the most profound doubts. In this regard, will you please ponder for a moment whether or not the assassination of a president is, as I think, the most subversive of crimes in our society and whether or not it has the effect of a coup d'etat.

Then ask your question of yourself, "what difference can it make."

Sincerely, Harold Weisberg

Harold Weisberg